

Deep Multi-Species Embedding

Di Chen
chendi9412@sjtu.edu.cn
Shanghai JiaoTong University

Yexiang Xue
yexiang@cs.cornell.edu
Cornell University

Shuo Chen
shuochen@cs.cornell.edu
Cornell University

Daniel Fink
df36@cornell.edu
Cornell Lab of Ornithology

Carla Gomes
gomes@cs.cornell.edu
Cornell University

Abstract

Understanding how species are distributed across landscapes over time is a fundamental question in biodiversity research. Unfortunately, most species distribution models only target a single species at a time, despite the fact that there is strong evidence that species are not independently distributed. We propose Deep Multi-Species Embedding (DMSE), which jointly embeds vectors corresponding to multiple species as well as vectors representing environmental covariates into a common high-dimensional feature space via a deep neural network. Applied to *eBird* bird watching data, our single-species DMSE model outperforms the commonly used random forest models and SVM in terms of accuracy. Our multi-species DMSE model further improves the single-species version. Through this model, we are able to confirm quantitatively many species-species interactions, which are only understood qualitatively among ecologists. As an additional contribution, we provide a graphical embedding of hundreds of bird species in the Northeast US.

Introduction

The distribution of species is an important index in detecting environmental degradation and climate change. Therefore, understanding how species are distributed across landscapes over time is a fundamental question in biodiversity research. However, most species distribution models only target a single species at a time (Phillips, Dudík, and Schapire 2004; Elith and Leathwick 2009; Fink, Damoulas, and Dave 2013), despite the fact that the living and diffusion of one species often depends on others. For example, American Robin and Blue Jay are more likely to be seen in the same place since the Blue Jay preys on American Robin eggs or fledglings and sometimes even steals its nest. Therefore, a model that predicts the occupancy of a collection of species instead of modelling each species individually is needed. The most straightforward way which directly formulates the probability of seeing a collection of species suffers from combinatorial intractability due to the large number of possible ways to form the collection. As a result, an efficient method of modelling the joint distribution of species in a large scale is still lacking.



Figure 1: The ecological relationship between American Robin and Blue Jay.

We propose a novel method called Deep Multi-Species Embedding which can jointly model the distribution of hundreds of species as well as the correlation among species. DMSE jointly embeds multiple species as well as environmental covariates into a high-dimensional feature vector space via a deep neural network. Each embedded vector carries semantic meaning to the modeled entity, and the inner products between them demonstrate the relationships between entities (such as environmental preference or correlation between species).

Applied to *eBird* bird watching data (Munson et al. 2012), our single-species DMSE model outperforms commonly used random forest models and SVM in terms of accuracy and log-likelihood. The experimental result also shows that our multi-species DMSE model further improves the single version on multi-species modeling. As the number of species goes up, the predictive performance of our multi-species DMSE keeps improving when compared with the single version.

In addition, we also show a visualization of the embedding for hundreds of bird species in the Northeast US. It provides an intuitive picture about species environmental preferences and the correlations among each other. Through this model, we are also able to quantitatively measure many species-species interaction which could only be qualitatively described by the ecologists.

Multi-Species Modelling

Our goal is to estimate the joint distribution of different species which can help us better understand the multi-species distribution based on the observation data. More formally, given a collection of species $\{species_1, \dots, species_n\}$ and the species observation data $D = \{(b_1, l_1), \dots, (b_N, l_N)\}$, we would like to estimate the




Figure 2: The left graph depicts the independent joint distribution of two species where the color from light yellow to red (better view in color) represents the probability from low to high. The probability mass in each quadrant represents the probability of each two-species co-occurrence. For example, the first quadrant represents the probability that two species occur together. The right graph is derived from the left one by adding a positive correlation between two species. Here, we plot the marginal distribution for each species on the upper side and left side of each graph. One can see, though we change the correlation between two species, the distribution of each species, unconditional of the other, remains the same.

distribution $\Pr(b_i|l_i)$. Here $b_i \in \{0, 1\}^n$ is an indicator for the species co-occurrence of each observation, $b_{i,j} = 1$ iff $species_j$ presents in that observation, and $l_i = (f_1, \dots, f_m)^T$ is an environmental feature vector that contains the weight of m relevant environmental covariates for that observation site. For ease of notation, we also use l_i to denote the observation site i in the following text.

From One Species to More

Our DMSE method originates from the probit model (Chib and Greenberg 1998) which is widely used to model binary outcomes, for example, whether a species is present or not. For the clarity of presentation, we start by describing how to model the distribution of single species using the probit model. For each $species_j$, we link the occurrence of $species_j$ at observation site l_i with a random variable $r_{i,j}$ where the probability $species_j$ presents at observation site l_i is equal to the probability that $r_{i,j} > 0$, i.e.

$$\Pr(b_{i,j} = 1|l_i) = \Pr(r_{i,j} > 0) \quad (1)$$

Here, $r_{i,j}$ follows a normal distribution $N(\mu_j, \sigma)$ where μ_j is a function of l_i and σ is fixed to be 1. According to the definition of normal distribution, a positive μ_j implies that the species is more likely to be present than absent and a negative μ_j implies the opposite. Therefore, we can model the distribution of each species by parameterizing each μ_j .

A general approach to model the joint distribution of multiple species is to simply joint the distribution of each species without their correlation which means the presence and absence of each species are independent. For ease of presentation, we call this kind of joint distribution “independent joint distribution”.

The left graph in the picture above (Fig.2) depicts the independent joint distribution of two species (American Robin and Blue Jay) corresponding to random variable $r_{i,1}$ and $r_{i,2}$. In the graph, the color from light yellow to red represents the probability from low to high and the probability mass in each quadrant represents the probability of each co-occurrence. For example, the probability mass in the

first quadrant shows the probability that American Robin and Blue Jay are present together at the observation site l_i . The one-dimensional distributions on the graphs’ upper side and left side are the marginal distributions for American Robin and Blue Jay respectively. The red area in each one-dimensional distribution represents the probability of the presence of each species unconditional of the other.

Since the independent joint distribution fails to model the correlation between species which widely exists in the real world, we upgrade the probit model by applying multivariate normal distribution over the n -dimensional random variables $r_i = (r_{i,1}, \dots, r_{i,n})$ i.e.

$$r_i \sim N_n(\mu, \Sigma) \quad (2)$$

where $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)^T$ and Σ is the covariance matrix.

In this way, each random variable $r_{i,j}$ still follows a normal distribution, but we can handle the correlation between species by parameterizing the covariance matrix Σ .

As shown in the right graph, we change the covariance between random variable $r_{i,1}$ and $r_{i,2}$ from 0 to a positive number ρ , then the joint distribution changes significantly. For example, the probability mass in the first quadrant becomes larger, which means these two species are more likely to be present together. Although we affect the joint distribution of two species by changing the covariance between $r_{i,1}$ and $r_{i,2}$, the marginal distribution of each random variable does not change. This means the probability of the presence of each species, unconditional of the other, is unaffected by the covariance. This property ensures that our model can maintain the predictive capability that only use the environmental preference of each species. Meanwhile, it can outperform the independent version when the species have correlations. In addition, if we regulate the variance of each species to be 1, the matrix Σ becomes a correlation matrix. Thus, we can further have a quantitative understanding about the species-species interactions which are only understood qualitatively among ecologists.




Figure 3: The intuitive visualization of DMSE framework.

Deep Multi-Species Embedding

In order to estimate the proper parameter μ and Σ for the multivariate normal distribution, we need to first model the species-environment relationship as well as the correlation between species. To achieve this, we first embed each $species_i$ with two vectors $s_i \in R^{d_1}$ and $\lambda_i \in R^{d_2}$ representing its environmental preference and interactive behavior respectively. Here d_1, d_2 are the dimensionality of these two vector spaces which are manually set¹. Here we choose to model these two characteristics separately instead of embedding to the same vector, otherwise a similar environmental preference will directly imply a high correlation since our model uses the inner products between vectors to measure the relationship between entities. However, it is possible that two species prefer a similar habitat but they do not have intensive interaction with each other. Using our model, they are not necessarily highly correlated.

When it comes to the environmental feature, we apply a deep neural network and a projection matrix to embed the low-dimensional raw environmental data into the same d_1 -dimensional feature space as the vectors s_i . For each observation data (b_i, l_i) ,

$$l_i \xrightarrow{\text{embed}} h_i = W \cdot DNN(l_i)$$

$$W : R^{d_1 \times n_{\text{output}}}, DNN(\cdot) : R^m \rightarrow R^{n_{\text{output}}} \quad (3)$$

Here $DNN(\cdot)$ is the notation for deep neural network², W is the projection matrix used for modulating the data range and mapping the DNN's output layer to the same high-dimensional feature space with s_i , and n_{output} is the dimension of output layer. Here we embed the environmental features via the deep neural network to enhance the predictive power of our model. We will discuss more details about the performance of the neural network in the experimental section.

With these embeddings for each species and the environmental features at each observation site, we use the inner-product $s_j^T h_i$ to score the relationship between $species_j$

¹In our experiments, we set $d_1 = d_2 = 100$.

²In our experiment, we use a 3-hidden-layer fully connected neural network using tanh as the activation function. The number of neurons in each hidden layer is 256, 256, 64.

and environmental features in the observation site l_i . Similarly, we also use the inner-product $\lambda_i^T \lambda_j$ to score the correlation between $species_i$ and $species_j$. In order to simplify the presentation, we concatenate the vectors s_i and λ_i as the columns into two matrices.

$$S = (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n) \in R^{d_1 \times n},$$

$$\Lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \in R^{d_2 \times n} \quad (4)$$

Using the notations in equation(2), (3) and (4), we can formulate our DMSE model as follows,

$$\Pr(b_{i,j} = 1 | l_i) = \Pr(r_{i,j} > 0),$$

$$r_i \sim N_n(\mu, \Sigma) \quad (5)$$

$$\text{where } \mu = S^T h_i = S^T (W \cdot DNN(l_i)) \text{ and } \Sigma = \Lambda^T \Lambda.$$

Here $\mu_j = s_j^T h_i$ scores the habitat suitability of $species_j$ at observation site l_i and $\Sigma_{i,j} = \lambda_i^T \lambda_j$ represents the correlation between $species_i$ and $species_j$. According to the definition of multivariate normal distribution, we derive that

$$\Pr(b_i | l_i) = \int_{L_1}^{R_1} \dots \int_{L_n}^{R_n} f(x) dx_1 \dots dx_n \quad (6)$$

$$\text{where } f(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^n |\Sigma|}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(x - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (x - \mu)\right),$$

$$\text{and } L_j = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } b_{i,j} = 1 \\ -\infty & \text{if } b_{i,j} = 0 \end{cases}, R_j = \begin{cases} +\infty & \text{if } b_{i,j} = 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } b_{i,j} = 0 \end{cases}$$

Finally, we train our model by maximizing the log-likelihood on the observation data. The parameters that should be trained are the matrix S, Λ, W and the parameters in the deep neural network denoted by θ_{DNN} .

$$S, \Lambda, W, \theta_{DNN} = \text{argmax}_{S, \Lambda, W, \theta_{DNN}} \sum_{i=1}^N \log \Pr(b_i | l_i) \quad (7)$$

Training and Testing

We use the stochastic gradient descent algorithm as proposed in (Duchi, Hazan, and Singer 2011; Bottou 2004) to optimize the log-likelihood function in equation (7). In order to train and test our DMSE model, we need to be able to compute the integration in equation (6) and its derivatives with respect to each parameter.

For the integration part, we use an adaptive algorithm proposed in (Genz 1992), implemented using function *mvn* in python (scipy.stats) which can calculate the cumulative distribution function (CDF) on multivariate normal distribution with a high accuracy (relative error $< 1e-6$).

To compute the derivative of $\Pr(b_i | l_i)$, one key observation is that if we can compute the derivative of $\Pr(b_i | l_i)$ with respect to μ and Σ , we can easily obtain other derivatives we want by simply applying the chain rule. Since the multivariate normal distribution is uniformly continuous, we first transform the derivative of the integration into the integration of the derivative of density function as follows.

$$\frac{\partial \log \Pr(b_i | l_i)}{\partial \mu} = \frac{1}{\Pr(b_i | l_i)} \int_{L_1}^{R_1} \dots \int_{L_n}^{R_n} \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial \mu} dx_1 \dots dx_n$$

$$\frac{\partial \log \Pr(b_i | l_i)}{\partial \Sigma} = \frac{1}{\Pr(b_i | l_i)} \int_{L_1}^{R_1} \dots \int_{L_n}^{R_n} \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial \Sigma} dx_1 \dots dx_n \quad (8)$$

Using the definition of multivariate normal distribution, we derive the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial \mu} &= f(x) \cdot F(\Sigma, \mu, x), \quad \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial \Sigma} = f(x) \cdot G(\Sigma, \mu, x) \\ \text{where } F(\Sigma, \mu, x) &= \Sigma^{-1}(x - \mu), \\ G(\Sigma, \mu, x) &= -\frac{1}{2}(\Sigma^{-1} - \Sigma^{-1}(x - \mu)(x - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1})\end{aligned}\quad (9)$$

According to equation (6), we know that

$$\int_{L_1}^{R_1} \dots \int_{L_n}^{R_n} \frac{f(x)}{\Pr(b_i|l_i)} dx_1 \dots dx_n = 1 \quad (10)$$

Thus, we can consider $\frac{f(x)}{\Pr(b_i|l_i)}$ as the density function of a distribution over a hyper-cube $Q \subseteq R^n$ corresponding to the integration range of equation(10). Thus, we can employ the Markov Chain Monte Carlo sampling method to estimate the derivative of $\log \Pr(b_i|l_i)$ with respect to μ and Σ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \log \Pr(b_i|l_i)}{\partial \mu} &= \int_{L_1}^{R_1} \dots \int_{L_n}^{R_n} \frac{f(x)}{\Pr(b_i|l_i)} F(\Sigma, \mu, x) dx_1 \dots dx_n \\ &= E[F(\Sigma, \mu, x)]_{x \in Q} \approx \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^M F(\Sigma, \mu, x_k)\end{aligned}\quad (11)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \log \Pr(b_i|l_i)}{\partial \Sigma} &= \int_{L_1}^{R_1} \dots \int_{L_n}^{R_n} \frac{f(x)}{\Pr(b_i|l_i)} G(\Sigma, \mu, x) dx_1 \dots dx_n \\ &= E[G(\Sigma, \mu, x)]_{x \in Q} \approx \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^M G(\Sigma, \mu, x_k)\end{aligned}\quad (12)$$

To make our model more efficient, we apply an enhancement for our model. Using the property of normal distributions, we know that $\Pr(|r_{i,j} - \mu_j| > k\Sigma_{j,j}) < \frac{e^{-k^2/2}}{k\sqrt{2\pi}}$. As the result, we can make a cut-off on L_i and R_i which significantly reduces our sample range and increases the convergence rate in our sampling process.

Related Works

We refer the reader to (Elith and Leathwick 2009) for a survey of general techniques used in correlative species distribution modeling. Modeling approaches in this area vary depending on the type of observational data and application objectives. The most commonly available observational data records only where species have been detected and identified, known as presence-only data. The authors of (Phillips, Dudík, and Schapire 2004) developed the popular MaxEnt model using maximum entropy to estimate the population intensity. More recently, the connections between Poisson point processes and MaxEnt have been used to develop presence-only data models (Fithian and Hastie 2013). Other data collection protocols, like eBird, record both when species are and are not detected. These presence-absence datasets are typically modeled using a variety of statistical and machine learning methods including additive logistic regression, random forests, and boosted regression trees. Occupancy models (MacKenzie 2006) use these data to explicitly model the observation and occupancy processes, resulting in stronger ecological inferences (Guillera-Arroita et al.

2015). Species distribution models have also been extended to capture population dynamics using cascading models (Sheldon and Dietterich 2011), Brownian Bridges (Horne et al. 2007), circuit theory (McRae et al. 2008), and non-stationary predictor response relationships (Fink, Damoulas, and Dave 2013). Recent extensions to joint species distribution models focus on modelling the unobserved environmental factors which potentially drive the correlated distribution (Harris 2015), and for spatiotemporal dynamics based on Gaussian processes (Thorson et al. 2016). The previous work most closely related to ours is (Harris 2015) which also uses the latent random variables to model correlations. However, the model in (Harris 2015) can only handle a few (no more than 10) random variables to infer the unobserved factors which potentially drive the correlated distribution, and it ignores the interaction between species. In contrast, our DMSE method can handle hundreds of latent random variables for each species and can quantitatively measure the interaction among species.

Our model is also inspired by embedding methods which are widely applied to many areas, including music (Chen et al. 2012), language (Bengio et al. 2003; Mikolov and Dean 2013), online purchase behavior (Rendle, Freudenthaler, and Schmidt-Thieme 2010) etc. The core idea is to learn a vector (or other structure) to represent each of the data points, so that the interaction in the vector space reflects the semantic meaning in the original data. Embedding methods have been proven to have better generalization performance and to provide a better data visualization as well. To our knowledge, we are the first to apply embedding methods to multi-species modelling.

Experiments

We work with crowd-sourced bird watching data collected from the successful citizen science project eBird (Munson et al. 2012). One record in this dataset is often referred to as a checklist in which the bird observer reports all the species he/she detects as well as the time and geographical location of the observation site. Crossed with the National Land Cover Database for the U.S. (Homer et al. 2015), we can estimate the landscape composition of each observation site l_i with 15 different land types such as the percentage of the water, forest, grass, etc. Besides the land types, we also include other environmental covariates of l_i such as the population density, the elevation, average temperature etc. For the use of training and testing, we transform all this data into the form (b_i, l_i) as described in the first paragraph of the Multi-Species Modelling section. The dataset for this experiment is formed by picking all the observation checklists from the Bird Conservation Region (BCR) 13 in the last two weeks of March from the year of 2002 to the year 2012. March is a migration period for BCR 13, therefore a lot of non-native birds pass over this region, which gives us excellent opportunities to observe their habitat choice during the migration. Here we choose the top 100 most frequently observed birds as the species collection which covers 97.6% of the records in our dataset.

In order to fight against overfitting, we use a 5-fold cross validation to validate the multiple choices of learning rate,




Figure 4: The left map visualizes the embeddings s_i representing the environmental preference of each species and the right graph depicts the embeddings λ_i corresponding to the correlation among species. One can see (the left map), birds of the same category cluster tightly and birds of the same breed also have a similar environmental preference. Compared with the right graph, one can find that the birds living in similar habitat have relative high correlation, but there are still some birds with high correlation that have a different environmental preference.

regularization weight and other hyper-parameters.

What do embeddings look like?

We start by giving a qualitative impression of the embeddings produced by our method and visualized by t-SNE algorithm (Maaten and Hinton 2008). Fig.4 visualizes the embeddings of environmental preference and interactive behavior (s_i and λ_i) of each species. In the picture, we manually assign the species into four main categories according to their habitat preference³: (1) **Birds living near residential areas**, such as House Sparrow, Common Grackle, American Robin, Blue Jay, Mallard, Canada Goose, etc. Most of them are easy to find in the backyards, city parks, parking lots and agricultural fields. The presence ratio of these species are more than 25% of the records since they are easy for bird-watchers to find. (2) **Birds living in wetlands**, such as Swamp Sparrow, Northern Rough-winged Swallow, Killdeer, etc. that live near the water but mainly feed on insects. (3) **Water birds**, such as gulls, herons and cormorants which need a large amount of open water. (4) **Birds living in forest and pasture**, such as warblers, woodpeckers, nuthatches, thrushes, hawks, etc. These kinds of birds always live in the forest, grassland, pasture, shrubs, or near forest edges. These are the four categories that do not overlap with each other.

One can see in the left map of Fig.4, the birds of the same category cluster tightly. For example, the birds living near the human settlements are all on the left of the graph, the birds living in wetlands and the water birds are on the right-top corner. Since the birds living in forest and pasture have a large habitat range, we further highlight three breeds in this category: the warblers, the woodpeckers and the raptors. It

³We get the habitat preference of birds from the website www.allaboutbirds.org

is interesting to note that the birds within a breed have a high similarity of habitat preference which coincides with the field observation.

When it comes to the embeddings of correlation (the right map), it can be observed that in most cases, the species living in similar places have a relative higher correlation. However, one can find some interesting cases comparing the left map and the right map. For example, although the Mallard and Canada Goose are more common to see near human habitation, the occurrence of these two birds still has a high correlation with other water birds. What is more, in the left map, we find that the locations of Blue Jay and American Robin are not very close, but from the right map, we know that they have a very high correlation which coincides with the ecological relationship as we described in the introduction section.

Predictive Performance of DMSE

While the visualization provides interesting qualitative insights, we now provide a quantitative evaluation of the model quality based on the predictive power. In our experiment, we analyze the performance of DMSE both on single-species modelling and multi-species modelling. Here we use two metrics to analyze the performance of each model: (1) **prediction accuracy**, i.e. the percentage that the model correctly predicts the occurrence of all species in the observation. In n -species modelling, we require the model to predict the occurrence (presence or absence) of each n species where there are totally 2^n possible results for each observation site. In addition, DMSE predicts the co-occurrence of n species by choosing the indicator $\tilde{b}_i$ with highest probability $\Pr(\tilde{b}_i|l_i)$. (2) **log-likelihood**, i.e. $\sum_{i=1}^N \log \Pr(b_i|l_i)$.

DMSE’s performance on a single-species model We compare the single-species predictive performance of DMSE with the commonly used random forest model and SVM in terms of prediction accuracy. Here we also analyze the effect of the deep neural network in the DMSE model by analyzing the performance of the DMSE model without neural network, in which we only use projection matrix W to embed the environmental features. We test these four models on different species from very common to rarely seen. As shown in Fig.5, the neural network makes a significant improvement on the predictive power of our model and with the help of neural network, our DMSE model outperforms other models. (Since in most cases you can not see rare birds, the prediction accuracy becomes very high on the birds rarely seen.)




Figure 5: With the help of neural network, our DMSE model outperforms other models on the prediction accuracy of species from very common to rarely seen.

What are the effects of correlation? We now explore whether the correlation plays an important role in multi-species modelling. We start by comparing the performance of multi-species DMSE and the single version of DMSE on modelling two-species distribution. The single version of DMSE means we model the multi-species distribution by modelling the distribution of each species separately without their correlation. According to our experimental results, the multi-species DMSE outperforms the single version on all the species pairs that we have tried. Because of the limitation of length, here we only show the performance on 3 pairs of species.




Figure 6: By modelling the correlation, the two-species DMSE outperforms the single version on each metric.

As shown in Fig.6, with the help of correlation, DMSE has a substantial improvement on multi-species modelling.

Therefore, the correlation between species plays a very important role in multi-species modelling. Furthermore, we provide a list which quantitatively measures the interaction between some species pairs with relatively high correlation.

Species Name	Species Name	correlation
Red-eyed Vireo	Eastern Wood Pewee	0.607
Common Grackle	Red-winged Blackbird	0.604
European Herring Gull	Great Black-backed Gull	0.580
Yellow Warbler	Common Yellowthroat	0.567
Blue Jay	American Robin	0.535
Common Grackle	American Robin	0.510
Blue Jay	Northern Cardinal	0.504
American Crow	American Robin	0.493
Common Grackle	European Starling	0.475
European Starling	Red-winged Blackbird	0.474

Table 1: The list for species pairs with high correlation. The correlation here is derived from covariance matrix Σ

When the number of species becomes larger, the prediction accuracy becomes meaningless since there are 2^n possible results. Therefore, we analyze the difference between multi-species DMSE and the single version of DMSE in terms of the log-likelihood.




Figure 7: As the number of species becomes larger, the performance of multi-species DMSE becomes better and better compared with the single version of DMSE.

One can see (Fig.7), as the number of species goes up, the predictive performance of our multi-species DMSE keeps improving when compared with the single version. This highlights the importance of modelling the correlation between species.

Conclusion

We present a novel Deep Multi-Species Embedding model that can handle the joint distribution of hundreds of species simultaneously. The ability to visualize the learned embeddings is also a key feature for easy interpretability and open-ended exploratory data analysis. Since our DMSE significantly outperforms the single version on multi-species modelling, it can potentially help ecologists get a better understanding about species distribution. DMSE is also able to provide a quantitative measure of the correlation between species which provides people a with more detailed understanding about species-species relationship. Furthermore, the embedding models described in the paper can easily be adapted and extended to include further information (e.g., spatio-temporal information), providing many directions for future work.

References

- [Bengio et al. 2003] Bengio, Y.; Ducharme, R.; Vincent, P.; and Jauvin, C. 2003. A neural probabilistic language model. *journal of machine learning research* 3(Feb):1137–1155.
- [Bottou 2004] Bottou, L. 2004. Stochastic learning. In *Advanced lectures on machine learning*. Springer. 146–168.
- [Chen et al. 2012] Chen, S.; Moore, J. L.; Turnbull, D.; and Joachims, T. 2012. Playlist prediction via metric embedding. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, 714–722. ACM.
- [Chib and Greenberg 1998] Chib, S., and Greenberg, E. 1998. Analysis of multivariate probit models. *Biometrika* 85(2):347–361.
- [Duchi, Hazan, and Singer 2011] Duchi, J.; Hazan, E.; and Singer, Y. 2011. Adaptive subgradient methods for online learning and stochastic optimization. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 12:2121–2159.
- [Elith and Leathwick 2009] Elith, J., and Leathwick, J. R. 2009. Species distribution models: ecological explanation and prediction across space and time. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* 40(1):677.
- [Fink, Damoulas, and Dave 2013] Fink, D.; Damoulas, T.; and Dave, J. 2013. Adaptive spatio-temporal exploratory models: Hemisphere-wide species distributions from massively crowd-sourced ebird data. In *AAAI*.
- [Fithian and Hastie 2013] Fithian, W., and Hastie, T. 2013. Finite-sample equivalence in statistical models for presence-only data. *The annals of applied statistics* 7(4):1917.
- [Genz 1992] Genz, A. 1992. Numerical computation of multivariate normal probabilities. *Journal of computational and graphical statistics* 1(2):141–149.
- [Guillera-Aroita et al. 2015] Guillera-Aroita, G.; Lahoz-Monfort, J. J.; Elith, J.; Gordon, A.; Kujala, H.; Lentini, P. E.; McCarthy, M. A.; Tingley, R.; and Wintle, B. A. 2015. Is my species distribution model fit for purpose? matching data and models to applications. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 24(3):276–292.
- [Harris 2015] Harris, D. J. 2015. Generating realistic assemblages with a joint species distribution model. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 6(4):465–473.
- [Homer et al. 2015] Homer, C. G.; Dewitz, J. A.; Yang, L.; Jin, S.; Danielson, P.; Xian, G.; Coulston, J.; Herold, N. D.; Wickham, J.; and Megown, K. 2015. Completion of the 2011 national land cover database for the conterminous united states-representing a decade of land cover change information. *Photogramm. Eng. Remote Sens* 81(5):345–354.
- [Horne et al. 2007] Horne, J. S.; Garton, E. O.; Krone, S. M.; and Lewis, J. S. 2007. Analyzing animal movements using brownian bridges. *Ecology* 88(9):2354–2363.
- [Maaten and Hinton 2008] Maaten, L. v. d., and Hinton, G. 2008. Visualizing data using t-sne. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 9(Nov):2579–2605.
- [MacKenzie 2006] MacKenzie, D. 2006. *Occupancy Estimation And Modeling: Inferring Patterns And Dynamics of Species Occurrence*. Elsevier Science & Tech.
- [McRae et al. 2008] McRae, B. H.; Dickson, B. G.; Keitt, T. H.; and Shah, V. B. 2008. Using circuit theory to model connectivity in ecology, evolution, and conservation. *Ecology* 89(10):2712–2724.
- [Mikolov and Dean 2013] Mikolov, T., and Dean, J. 2013. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. *Advances in neural information processing systems*.
- [Munson et al. 2012] Munson, M. A.; Webb, K.; Sheldon, D.; Fink, D.; Hochachka, W. M.; Iliff, M.; Riedewald, M.; Sorokina, D.; Sullivan, B.; Wood, C.; and Kelling, S. 2012. The eBird Reference Dataset, Version 4.0.
- [Phillips, Dudík, and Schapire 2004] Phillips, S. J.; Dudík, M.; and Schapire, R. E. 2004. A maximum entropy approach to species distribution modeling. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-first International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML '04*, 83–. New York, NY, USA: ACM.
- [Rendle, Freudenthaler, and Schmidt-Thieme 2010] Rendle, S.; Freudenthaler, C.; and Schmidt-Thieme, L. 2010. Factorizing personalized markov chains for next-basket recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 19th international conference on World wide web*, 811–820. ACM.
- [Sheldon and Dietterich 2011] Sheldon, D. R., and Dietterich, T. G. 2011. Collective graphical models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 1161–1169.
- [Thorson et al. 2016] Thorson, J. T.; Ianelli, J. N.; Larsen, E. A.; Ries, L.; Scheuerell, M. D.; Szuwalski, C.; and Zipkin, E. F. 2016. Joint dynamic species distribution models: a tool for community ordination and spatio-temporal monitoring. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*.